



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

McS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/968,208 11/12/97 HIGUCHI R 9397

IM22/1129

VINCENT M. POWERS
APPLIED BIOSYSTEMS
850 LINCOLN CENTRE DRIVE
FOSTER CITY CA 94404

EXAMINER

SNAY, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED:

11/29/00

27

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

08/968,208

Applicant(s)

HIGUCHI, RUSSELL

Examiner

Jeffrey R. Snay

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2000 .
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2000 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 14 February 2000 is: a) ☐ approved b) ☒ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____ .
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____ .

1. The request filed on 11/20/00 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/968,208 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

2. The amendment filed 02/14/00 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: newly added Figures 6A and 6B, and the brief description of the new figures. Although the previous office action, paper no. 18, indicated that the drawings failed to show the features of the claimed apparatus, Applicant is reminded that any new figures added after the filing date of the application must be limited to any structure which is specifically described in the specification, as originally filed.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1743

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 30-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haff (1989) in view of Mackay (EP 0266881).

The reasons for this rejection are as set forth in paragraph 5 of the previous Office action, paper no. 18. Regarding the newly recited limitation of the reaction vessels being sealed, one of ordinary skill would have recognized the advantages of performing the analysis in the apparatus of the prior art utilizing sealed reaction vessels in order to prevent contamination as well as optical cross-talk. It was notoriously well known in the field of optical analysis for form sample containers, or a wall surface thereof, from an optically transparent material for this very purpose.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 02/14/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The arguments were fully addressed in the last Office action, paper no. 23.

6. Claims 30-47 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-27 of copending Application No. 08/266,061. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. See paragraph 3 of the last Office action. Regarding the newly recited limitation of a sealed reaction vessel, such

Art Unit: 1743

would have been obvious for the same reasons applied in the grounds of rejection, above.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. This is a continued prosecution application of applicant's earlier Application No. 08/968208. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1743

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Snay whose telephone number is (703) 308-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (703) 308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7718 for regular communications and (703) 308-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5665.



Jeffrey R. Snay
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1743

jrs
November 28, 2000